Remarks

Reconsideration of the application is requested. Claims 26 and 27 have been rejected under 35

U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Gauvin et al., USPN 5,790,800 in view of Kikinis, USPN

6,421,325.

It is somewhat unclear as to what is being relied on in Gauvin et al. for the various claim elements.

As best understood, the description on col. 3, lines 30-35 (a mobile computer) has been pointed to as the

claimed "wireless module" and col. 1, line 50 to col. 2, line 14 (basically, discussing that to connect a mobile

computer to a wireless network, a user may have to provide security codes) has been pointed to as the

claimed "peripheral device". Evidently, the wireless network is being used as the claimed "peripheral

device".

As now amended, Claim 26 specifies that the "peripheral device" is a portable computing device

(several examples of which are disclosed on page 4, last paragraph) and that the wireless module can be

removably engaged with the peripheral device (as disclosed in the last sentence of the abstract and page 2,

lines 6-13). No such combination of structure has been taught in Gauvin et al. Furthermore, Claim 26

requires that the security code be provided to the wireless module; in Gauvin et al., the relied-upon "wireless

module" does not have to have access to the security code, but rather, in the relied-upon section of Gauvin

et al., the user must input the security code through undetermined channels to the phone system. Claims 26

and 27 are patentable.

Neither of the references appears to teach new claim 28, support for which can be found on page 7,

lines 13-21.

1168-107.AM2

CASE NO.: 50P4257.05   PATENT
Serial No.: 09/972,183   Filed: October 5, 2001
February 11, 2005
Page 5

   The proferred suggestion to combine Kikinis (a reference that teaches "personal routers") with Gauvin

et al., namely, "for enhanced connectivity", is inapposite to the proposed combination. Specifically, Kikinis

teaches that its routers are for editing data transmission routes in DNT applications, whereas Gauvin et al.

appears to rely on predetermined routing being in place (see, e.g., the abstract, stating "the procedures and

client application expect a connection to be in place"). For that reason, the skilled artisan would be motivated

away from modifying Gauvin et al. with Kikinis as proposed, since allowing editing of routing in Gauvin et

al. would appear to frustrate the expectation of a known connection being in place.

        Respectfully submitted,

        John V. Rogitz
        Registration No. 33,549
        Attorney of Record
        750 B Street, Suite 3120
        San Diego, CA 92101
        Telephone: (619) 338-8075

JLR:jg

1168-107.AM2